

Remarks

Claims 1-19, 30 and 31 are currently pending. Claims 30 and 31 were allowed in the October 28, 2005 Office Action. However, that Office Action rejected the other pending claims. Through the above amendment to claim 1, claims 1-19 have now been further amended to more clearly distinguish over this newly cited art. Hence, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended claims 1-19 as well.

Previously Allowed Subject Matter

As noted above, claims 30 and 31 were indicated to be allowed in the October 28, 2005 Office Action. Since they are not being amended by this response, they should remain allowed.

Art Rejections

The Office Action indicated that absent reliance on Zayas there would be a deficiency with respect to all rejections as none of the other references would then adequately teach or suggest a hook and loop attachment system, much less one in this type of context. It is respectfully submitted that even the addition of Zayas does not render obvious claims 1-19, particularly in view of the further amendment of claim 1 above.

Zayas uses her hook and loop attachment to attach a sponge to a base, not to attach her cover to the base. Thus, she is using a hook and loop attachment for a quite different purpose. Her cover is attached in a very different way (tab and slot).

Moreover, Zayas is using this type of connection with a manual scrubber. The forces applied during manual scrubbing are quite different from those provided from a high speed reciprocating motor. Prior to the present invention one would have thought (if such a structure were even considered) that a cleaning pad mounted to a high speed reciprocating device by just a hook and loop attachment would have been too easily stripped off during use.

Claim 1 (and thus claims 2-19) have thus now been amended to clarify that the cleaning pad is also reciprocating, and further that this is happening at extremely high speed. Support for the speed limitation is found at, among other places, prior claim 8. A conforming change to claim 8 is also made.

In particular it should be noted that when a hook and loop type attachment is used, the most secure attachment requires the entire facing surfaces to have the hooks and loops in contact. In the present situation much of the area that could otherwise have been used for that purpose is taken up by the packet cavity, leaving only a frame of hook or loop material around the pocket. Thus, once one provides a structure with a pocket to receive the packet, consideration of a hook and loop fastener system would be even less likely.

Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-19 as further amended, and claims 30-31 as previously allowed, are believed to be in allowable form. Confirmation of allowance of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

No fees are believed necessary for consideration of this response. However, should any additional fees be needed for full consideration of this amendment, please charge any fees believed necessary in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 10-0849 .

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Long, et al.

By: 

Linda Blair Meier

Reg. No.: 39,769

Attorney For Applicant

S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

1525 Howe Street

Racine, Wisconsin 53403

(262) 260-2474